

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/656,005	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LAW ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> STEVEN B. THERIAULT	<b>Art Unit</b> 2179	

**All Participants:**

(1) STEVEN B. THERIAULT.

(2) Jeff Canfield.

**Date of Interview:** 3 December 2009

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*Appeal Brief filed 09/08/2009*

Claims discussed:

*1*

Prior art documents discussed:

*Brandl in view of Heimlich*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Steven B Theriault/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2179

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted applicant's representative for an interview. Upon review of the appeal brief filed 09/08/2009 the examiner noticed a difference in interpretation of the claims and the prior art definitions. The examiner contacted applicant with a suggestion to amend the claims to incorporate the input matrix of figure 5 and 6. Clearly the inventive concept, as shown in the drawings, was the input into the graphical display within a cell that then indicated an input to a state machine. The particular input at cell x.y contains both a state and status of the process plant and also indicates the next state to transition to. The prior art did not suggest or disclose in combination the features of independent claims as a whole. The examiner suggested rolling the subject matter of claim 4 or 5 into claim 1 to capture the user interaction with the matrix to configure the inputs to the state machine function block in a process plant. Applicant agreed on 12/04/2009 and the claims as amended are allowed. .